

ERROR TREATMENT: TEACHERS' VIEW X STUDENTS' VIEW

Susan Catherine Brown

Resumo: Resumo: O artigo apresenta dois estudos sobre Tratamento do Erro, o primeiro resulta de uma entrevista feita a dois professores de um Curso Particular de Inglês de uma mesma Escola, e o segundo é o resultado de uma entrevista feita a seis alunos também de um Curso Particular de Inglês, ambas de Porto Alegre. O estudo apresenta uma revisão bibliográfica e três diferentes perspectivas sobre o Erro, focando na perspectiva sociocultural, onde o Tratamento do Erro é considerado benéfico no ensino de uma língua estrangeira, e a interação do professor junto ao aluno é mais ativa, contribuindo para que o "feedback" seja positivo para a aprendizagem da mesma. O artigo compara as observações dos professores e dos alunos sobre o Erro e o Tratamento do Erro.

Abstract: This paper presents two separate studies done about Error Treatment, the first one, resulting from an interview with two teachers working in the same private English Course, and the second study, with six students also from the same kind of private English Course. Both schools are in Porto Alegre, RS. This paper also presents a Literature Review about Error, and three different perspectives about Error, focusing on the *sociocultural* view, where Error Treatment is considered beneficial when teaching a Second Language, and the teacher interaction with the student is more active and supportive, giving the necessary assistance when providing corrective feedback. Finally, it compares the teachers' and students' observations about Error, and Error Treatment.

1 - Introduction

Error Treatment is something that has come to a similar definition as medical treatment, as the word “treatment” indicates that there is the need of healing (ALLRIGHT; BAILEY 1991, apud SCHERER 2000), and we know that illnesses need a period of regular treatment in order to have a positive result. And, sometimes, even the treatment doesn’t end in a positive way, so we can say that correcting an error doesn’t mean that the problem is solved. If there is place for this analogy, if we can compare teachers to doctors when treating something that must be changed into a better situation, we can say that there is a certain amount of responsibility in the hands of the ones who are applying the “medicine”, but, again, this does not mean that everything is solved right away, sometimes it takes a long time of care.

Error Treatment is an important part of learning a language, and many studies have contributed to establishing its relevance. According to FREUDENBERGER and LIMA (2006)

the correction of linguistic errors, when searching to incorporate the learner’s utterance to the classroom speech, or, at least, to the language knowledge/experience built before, can be useful as a support to the development of the learner, helping to build this knowledge.

The daily task of a L2 teacher inside the classroom involves much more than having a lesson plan, having nice and creative activities displayed, and giving information to the students. Teaching means that you are going to deal also with the unpredictable, mysterious and challenging situations that compound different classroom environments. So, you might have a “prescription” that fits perfectly as a panacea for a group of students, but could have no effect on others. Despite having some formulas to help students throughout the learning process, teachers still face difficult situations, insecurities, and uncertainties when providing feedback to the students.

On the other hand, we have students also dealing with their difficulties, their expectations, anxiety and acceptance (or not) involving error correction. Do students consider making errors a normal part of the learning process, or is it a complex and scaring issue for them ? Do they want to be corrected? Do they think they should be corrected?

I think that the more we study about Error Treatment in the classroom, the more “comfortable” teachers and students can become when giving and receiving feedback. Also, I believe that if more research is done in this field, teachers will have opportunities of discovering other ways to deal with Error Treatment, which could come from the experience of different sources, with more observation on the way teachers are dealing nowadays with correction, how the students react when being corrected and if there is any

change after the feedback is given. Of course, this process requires a longitudinal study, and this present study suggests a brief idea of what is possible to investigate with teachers and students' opinions about this polemic issue - error correction while learning a second language.

On an earlier study, as a research work for *Metodologia da Pesquisa Científica em L2* with Prof. Dr. Marília dos Santos Lima, during a Post Graduation Course at UNIRITTER (Especialização em Ensino da Língua Estrangeira – 2006), I devised a questionnaire about Error Treatment for teachers. The purpose was to elicit teachers' view about Error Treatment, and the questions were applied with two teachers from the same private English course. This current study expands that previous one by getting students perspectives on the same issues. The students' questions are: 1) What does "error" mean? 2) Do you think that the teacher should take into consideration the student's personality when making any correction? 3) When doing any correction, do you think the teacher should consider the students' proficiency level? 4) Is correction always profitable for the student? Is there any moment when being corrected can become a negative experience? Give your opinion.

Considering that one of the most useful tools to understand the patterns of Error Treatment in the interaction between teachers and students is to identify the reaction of the latter to the correction done (FREUDENBERGER and LIMA, 2006), I understand that having the students' opinion about the four questions listed above is important to complement this study. Even though it may be true that students' behavior in real life does not always coincide with their answers to a questionnaire, I believe it is relevant to pay attention to what they are expressing through their ideas about being corrected.

First, this paper presents the theoretical background related to Error Treatment, with Definition of Error; Three different perspectives on Corrective Feedback and Studies on Corrective Feedback. Then it presents the Methodology applied.

Next, it presents the previous study made with the two teachers, and continues with the students perspectives on the same issue. In the last part, I discuss findings, and finally, present my conclusion based on both studies. There are two other complementary sections to this paper, which are, a list of References and Attachement 1, that contains the students' answers to the questionnaire.¹

¹The answers of the questionnaire were kept as I received them originally, in the students' First Language.

2 - Definition of Error

Three different theories related to the development of L2 learning are considered important references to present the concept of Error: Behaviorism, Cognitivism and Sociocultural theory.

In Behaviorism, error is considered a deviation from the ruling pattern. According to FREUDENBERGER and LIMA (2002), in L2 learning, this pattern is represented by the “native speaker” (as a myth) of the target language. In this method, the learner acquires the language from intensive imitation and repetition, and tends to transfer the knowledge of L1 to L2, and inevitably produces errors. In order to avoid bad habits formation, any error should be corrected immediately.

Some researchers noticed that this method was not being successful to Second Language Learning, and the result was just a repetition of sentences without meaning to the student, who was not able to communicate when having to face the “real world” because of this mechanical way of learning a language. Also, they stated that there are errors which are not related to the L1 transfer (CODER, 1967, ALLWRIGHT; BAILEY, 1991, ELLIS, 1994), and so the learning process couldn't be so limited and simplistic. CODER (1967) brought an important contribution to the analysis of the learner's language when presenting his theory about interlanguage, using this term to refer to the language produced by the student. According to MENTI (2006), this theory was revolutionary not only to the conception of error, but also to how we learn a language:

If what the learner produces is his own language in development, then, what he produces cannot be considered an error, but instead, it is a product of the learning process. This concept of error is intimately linked to the cognitivist theory, which sees the language acquisition as a natural process with many stages, a creative process where the learner creates his language and improves the language skills while passing through evolutionary stages² (p. 18-19).

The changes concerning L2 teaching and learning led to different attitudes from the teacher inside the classroom. Following a strong conviction from the communicative approach, from the Cognitivist theory, the goal was to help the student to communicate in the target language, with little or no correction of errors produced by the student, at least the ones related to grammar structure. The main point was to be tolerant and respectful to the natural development of the student.

According to FREUDENBERGER and LIMA (2006), contrasting Cognitivism or the communicative approach, the Sociocultural theory considers that the teacher's

² I have done all the translations of the Brazilian professors' and students' quotations.

performance and active participation with the students in a classroom, can make a difference in their learning process. The communicative approach sees that the individual can develop language alone, following a natural acquisition process, and in this case does not need corrective feedback.

On the other hand, the Sociocultural theory believes that the individual needs to interact with the other in order to learn, so the social environment gives the possibility for the first, and external stage of learning, and from this contact, consequently, the student can internalize the language knowledge. According to the authors, this conception gives more space to the voice of the teacher, and teaching and correcting receives an important position, which are two common roles in the interaction between teacher and learner.

VYGOTSKY (apud DABBAGH, 1999), who is responsible for the social development theory of learning, claimed that social interaction between a child and a parent, or a teacher, helps cognitive development.

MENTI (2006) reinforces this thought by stating that through the Sociocultural perspective, the emphasis is in relation to the social instead of to the individual. The researcher mentions that Vygotsky, in his book "Thought and Language" (1972), explains that the assistance that comes from interaction with the other person produces the necessary support, or *scaffolding*. Scaffolding is the structure built alongside a building when a new building is being built or when a building is being repaired (here repair can be associated to Error Treatment if comparing the building to the language learning "construction"). This idea can also be transferred to the Second Language learning process and the role of the teacher.

To understand *scaffolding* as a teaching strategy it is necessary to introduce Vygotsky's concept about Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The author defines ZPD as a difference between what a person can do alone and what this same person can do with the assistance of another one. For instance, what a child or a student can do on his own is considered the actual developmental level, but according to VYGOTSKY (apud YU, 2003) ZPD is "the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 3).

At the same time, in this *scaffolding* process, the teacher provides new information to the students, or prepares them to develop any activity during the class, and has also the chance to examine the students performance before giving feedback.

3 - Three different perspectives on Corrective Feedback

Before presenting the interviews, it is important to identify the position of Corrective Feedback during the development of the three important theories mentioned above: Behaviorism, Cognitivism and Sociocultural Principles, and also three essential elements referring to the learning process, which are:

Input, Negative Evidence and Output

These three concepts are important when speaking of Error treatment, so, before presenting the approach of Corrective Feedback, I will briefly define them. LIGHTBOWN and SPADA (1990) consider Positive Evidence, or Input as everything that is possible in the target language. The teacher provides the Input in class while teaching, presenting materials (texts, video, songs, grammar explanation, etc.) as a model of the target language. Negative Evidence is exposing the student to what is not possible in L2. This means that it is the moment when the teacher applies Corrective Feedback to the student, after noticing an error or mistake in some utterance. The third element, Output, is what the learner produces with the knowledge of the language. Output is linked to correction. It is only possible to correct students according to what they can produce with the language.

Behaviorism and Focus on FormS

Behaviorism in Linguistics was based on SKINNER'S (1957) studies related to stimulus-response (Psychology). Learners are rewarded for correct productions, developing stimulus-response connections, or in other words, students' successful responses are positively reinforced. The Audio-Lingual Method follows this principle. Learning a language should be restricted to observable inputs and outputs. Knowledge was based on the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (Lado 1957, Fries 1945) where two languages are similar, positive transfer from one language to the other can happen; where they are different, negative transfer inference happens. In this method, learning a language is a matter of creating habits, the learner is exposed to certain structures and sentences doing lots of drilling (repetition) until they memorize the dialogues. On the other hand, in order to avoid bad habits when learning a language, errors should be immediately corrected.

Behaviorists see errors as systematic deviations made by learners who have not yet mastered the rules of L2. Errors could be predicted and explained as transfer of the mother tongue. Learners cannot self-correct an error because it is a product reflective of their current stage of L2 development. So, the teacher has an important role which involves the intensive teaching of specific grammatical features. This kind of Error Treatment is called Focus on FormS.

Cognitivism and Focus on Meaning

Opposing Behaviorism, CORDER (1967) was considered responsible for raising issues which became central to studies of Interlanguage. Interlanguage, as the word suggests, is a transitional stage where the second language learner constructs his own language system that contains elements of his mother tongue and elements of the second language. The learner uses his own resources to produce the new language and gradually develops the rule-system of the target language. Therefore, in this cognitive view, errors are not considered negative, they reflect the student's temporary language system and a natural part of the learning process, opening a way for communicative teaching methods. In the Cognitivist theory (Communicative Approach) teachers could use teaching activities (group work or pair work) without worrying about constant supervision of students' errors.

As CORDER (1967) observed, errors in learners' production are part of a process where the learners are testing what they are learning, using their own resources on an ongoing hypothesis formulation, that can help them organize the information they have about the language.

Therefore, in the Cognitivist theory errors are not considered negative, for they reflect the student's temporary language system and are a natural part of the learning process. The main focus is to allow learners to communicate, so correction is not a priority, unless students have a problem with communication. This kind of instruction is also referred as Focus on Meaning.

Sociocultural Theory and Focus on Form

The Communicative Approach was contested by researchers who studied French immersion programs in Canada, reporting that learners did not reach linguistic accuracy, even after years of immersion in those programs. According to LIMA (2002), providing a broad quantity of input is not enough for the L2 learner to reach a high level proficiency in the language.

Trying to add negotiation on Form to a communicative context, LIGHTBOWN and SPADA (1990, n.c.) suggest that "accuracy, fluency and general communicative skills are probably better developed by instruction based fundamentally on meaning, but in its guidance, they should be suitable activities with Focus on Form and correction on context."

Focus on Form teaching can adopt principles of the Sociocultural principles (MENTI, 2006; LIGHTBOWN, 1998; SWAIN, 2000; SWAIN; LAPKIN, 1998; OHTA, 2000; DONATO, 1994). Here, errors are seen as a natural product in learning, but it is believed that learners benefit from *feedback* provided by the person who knows more, who they are interacting with. Through the Focus on Form perspective, corrective

feedback helps in the learning process giving assistance to the learner, working as a *scaffolding* that learners will be able to use to build their speech.

As LIGHTBOWN and SPADA (1993, apud Cunha and Menti 2005) claimed, Focus on Form instruction will have a better result within a communicative interaction, where the student is trying to express his ideas, and has real interest to apply the correct structure to communicate. So, in this approach, the adequate moment for structure care should be inserted in a communicative environment.

According to LIGHTBOWN (1998), Focus on Form instruction is connected to the socio interactionist language acquisition tradition, where one can learn through social interaction. In this approach, the performance of the teacher in the classroom is considered more active and relevant than the Cognitive approach. Through interacting with the student, the teacher has the role to teach and correct, and also to help the flow and continuity of the communicative interaction.

According to MENTI (2006, p. 20), who also adopts the principles of the Sociocultural theory, the learner needs to interact with others in order to learn, supposing that learning happens before in social – exterior context, and then is internalized. Menti noted that “this conception gives room for the role of the teacher to provide information and corrective feedback – two actions common to interaction between the teacher and the student, between the one who knows and the one who does not know”.

Although errors are viewed as natural, and should not be prevented, corrective feedback is taken into consideration as an important part of the learning process, and the teacher has an active role in this interaction, and can interfere by helping the learner to identify and use the correct structures of the language, still having in mind the emphasis on the communicative usage of the target language.

Following MENTI (2006), I also believe that Error Treatment can be a social and interactive procedure, and studies related to corrective feedback can be guided by the sociocultural principles. In this study, my questionnaire was focused mainly in the definition of error and how to deal with corrective feedback.

4 - Studies on Corrective Feedback

When dealing with corrective feedback, there are some patterns depicted from research, which are worth mentioning in this study. Examining the patterns of Error Treatment in an adult ESL classroom, Lyster and Ranta (1997), as cited in PANOVA and Lyster (2002), identified six types of corrective feedback in a research in French immersion classes:

Explicit correction provides explicit signals to the student that there is an error in the previous utterance. It involves a clear indication to the student that an utterance was ill-formed and also provides the correct form.

Recast is an implicit corrective feedback move that reformulates or expands an ill-formed or incomplete utterance in an unobtrusive way. The teacher repeats the student's utterance making the necessary changes to correct the sentence.

Clarification requests elicits reformulation or repetition from the student with respect to the form of the student's ill-formed utterance. Often this type of feedback seeks clarification of the meaning as well.

Metalinguistic feedback refers to either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct answer.

Elicitation is a corrective technique that prompts the learner to self-correction. There are three ways of eliciting the correct form from the students: (a) when the teacher pauses and lets the student complete the utterance, (b) when the teacher asks an open question, and (c) when the teacher requests a reformulation of the ill-formed utterance.

Repetition of error is when the teacher repeats the ill-formed part of the student's utterance, usually with a change in intonation.

Of course, there are some other ways of correction, but the purpose here is to give a general idea of the patterns teachers use in class. Considering Focus on Form, where Error Treatment is possible to occur, the patterns described above are some of the ways corrective feedback is dealt with in class.

5 - Methodology

The data were collected in a first moment with two teachers of the same private English Course, and later, a second interview was done with six students of a different private English Course, that follows the same principles of teaching with a communicative approach.

The first interview, with the teachers, had the purpose to investigate their beliefs and procedures when dealing with Error Treatment. The interviews were done individually, recorded and transcribed. The second part of this work, was done with a questionnaire sent by e-mail to 41 students, where six students answered and sent the questionnaire back by e-mail. The objective of collecting these data was to analyse the students' answers, and then contrast teachers' with students' answers to the three same questions about Error

Treatment. I have changed only the fourth question for the students, which was different for the teachers' study (4) In your opinion what is the ideal classroom?).

I changed the last question to be more objective with the purpose of this study, as I wanted to know from some learners if they always consider positive to be corrected or not. I consider valid and possible to compare the two studies, because in the first study, the teachers included in their answers their opinions about the fourth question made to the students: (4) Is correction always profitable for the student? Is there any moment when being corrected can become a negative experience? Give your opinion).

The two teachers interviewed were colleagues at the same private English Course in Porto Alegre, based on The Communicative Approach. One of them graduated from "Letras" at Puc in 2000, and has worked at a private English Course in Porto Alegre since then. She also took the Post Graduation Course in "Letras," "Especialização do Ensino da Língua Inglesa," at UNIRITTER, in 2005. The other teacher interviewed, graduated from Social Sciences at UFRGS, has a Master's Degree in Anthropology (UFRGS) and is taking a Doctorate Course in Anthropology at UFRGS. She got a scholarship from UFRGS, and she does not work at a private English Course anymore.

From the six students interviewed, three were indicated by an English Professor who works at a private English Course, and three students were recommended by one of my classmates at Uniritter, taking the same Post Graduation Course (Especialização em Língua Inglesa - Letras), who also works at the same private English Course. The students are from Pre-Intermediate and Intermediate Level.

6 - Findings

6.1 - Teachers' Interview

The data of this part of the study were drawn from a recorded interview with two teachers who were interviewed individually with the same questions, with the aim of observing their personal beliefs when giving feedback to their students in class with oral and written production.

When asked about the meaning of error, the first teacher interviewed said that:

Error is when we make something that is not what corresponds in the second language, for example, so if you have to use a specific verb tense and you are not using at that time, so you are making an error for that language. It is not what is expected from you, following the pattern that each language has as its own rules. So when you make something that does not correspond to what is expected, then we can say that you are making an error.

In another segment she says:

I believe when you are learning a language you make errors all the time. While they are unconscious, you are just making them without realizing that you are making them, they are not a problem for you, you think you are doing the right thing. And we have this experience as a teacher, that sometimes students think they know a lot, they speak “fluently”, they think they have command of the language with lots of errors or mistakes, and even if you correct, they say “Ok teacher!” but they continue doing the same. They are not aware of the problem. So, is it possible to treat this, if the student cannot see it as a problem? And now I have a student that when I ask her something in English, she says “No entiendo, no existe.” How can you interact with her, or do any correction? And if I correct the other students they can complain that they are corrected but this “special student” is not, so I might get into trouble with this group...

The second teacher interviewed said that “error is a persistent mistake, when the student doesn’t know something and speaks in a wrong way constantly, and he doesn’t fix this mistake because he thinks that’s the right way.”

Here we can show a parallel between both teachers that have similar ideas about treating an error that is not considered ill-formed in the students’ minds, as they are not aware of it, and a teacher has the duty of pointing out that the production presented is wrong. So, here both teachers are describing common situations of being aware that many times students do not notice that they are wrong when producing the target language, and as educators they feel it is necessary to interfere. Moreover, T1 expresses a situation where it becomes harder for teachers to provide feedback, when meeting barriers through facing students who are not motivated to be in class, and can even have a negative interference in a group.

The next excerpts deal with treating errors in class, discussing if there are certain rules adopted, if they give different attention to each case, and what is the procedure to set up parameters when correcting:

S – Do you take the students personality into consideration when making any correction?

T1 – Yes, definitely. First month of class I try not to correct. First I try to get the group, get the mood of the group, see each one as an individual, I like to have the group with me, and then after that I start with the necessary error correction. But in the first classes I let them speak, I let them show themselves. Their personality for me is very important. For example, I can’t call on a shy student: “Speak! Tell me”, or a very talkative one, who is feeling that “Ok, I’m doing well”, and then you destroy this person, like “Stop, this is wrong”... No way, this is not me. I can’t do it.

The second teacher interviewed answered the same question:

T2 - Usually when we have the first class I make a kind of a deal with them about this. I ask them how do they feel about this and what kind of correction they expect. So, it's a kind of a negotiation process. Because I know that some students are more sensitive than others to error correcting and then if I do something or if I interrupt the student that is speaking something wrong, I'm afraid that I might offend the person or he may get upset with me. So, always in the first class, I tell them: "Listen, do you have any problem with me correcting your pronunciation mistakes, or grammar mistakes, or anything?" "I usually ask, and usually they have a positive answer. I think because they have this positive answer, when I correct them it's something normal, because we negotiated before. I asked them if I could and most of the times they say "yes". They say: "Please, do. Because I need this to go on." And then I feel comfortable and I don't feel bad about correcting them.

I also tell them in the first class: "Listen, we are all here learning, so please, don't be afraid of making any mistakes. If I correct you don't take it personally, I'm just trying to help you". So I have this little speech about how is correction important so that they don't feel bad, and if they are shy, they shouldn't worry about it, because everybody does mistakes. Sometimes, with shy students I don't talk to them in front of the class, I go to their seats, while they are doing some activity and correct them privately. But with other students I interrupt when they commit the error, because I think this is the time that it works, if I do this later, there is no more connection. Anyway, if the focus is on fluency, I don't interrupt, I let them go ahead.

We can notice that both teachers are respectful with their students and, with different personal behavior, since the beginning they are worried about investigating how they can interfere with Error Treatment without having a negative impression, nor causing embarrassment among peers.

S – How do you relate error correction and the students' proficiency level?

T1 - If you have a student who's in the Basic Level, you know what you can expect from him in terms of fluency and accuracy. There is a limit there. And, of course, you have to correct but you have to give lots of input, conditions to the student learn. And I think things should be guided in this level, and if they are guided you can see if the student is learning actually or if he's just repeating what's given. But, correction is necessary since the beginning in all levels and the teacher has to be aware of what can be expected. You have to provide more, and expect less in terms of production. And be careful with the correction, because they are at the beginning. But you have to correct. With Intermediate level, we are worried about fluency, but I notice that students want to feel more confident about the structure before speaking, so I help them with accuracy. Advanced groups are easier to teach, they have more command of the language, we can balance fluency and accuracy, but we have to give more attention to fluency.

The second teacher also answered this question:

T2- The higher the level, you have the biggest need for correction because they have to be fluent and proficient, and then you have to be more careful. Probably, with higher levels I would pay more attention to their errors, and probably correct them at that time, and make them realize that they are wrong. Well, the lower level students, I think it's not so good to correct them all the time because then they feel constrained ... that anything they will say is wrong. So, I think that sometimes it's okay to let them speak even if it's wrong, I tell them that I don't care if they do the "Tarzan" speech... I don't care, I just want them to speak, because I think it's a process, and after they realize the mistake, they correct by themselves. So I think I'd be more picky with the advanced students.

In my opinion, both teachers have similar criteria considering different proficiency levels, changing a little when it concerns advanced levels, where T1 seems to have a more relaxed attitude towards the students, and T2 seems to be more demanding. And I would ask, who is right, who is wrong? I think they are both totally acceptable attitudes, they are following their beliefs, and different approaches can work for each teacher.

Another aspect investigated was about what makes a good language teacher. T1 said that, as a professional, a good teacher has to be always a good learner, needs to study, develop the four skills (speaking, reading, listening and writing) constantly, and learn more vocabulary. But she considered that also the psychological aspect is very important, the teacher needs to be a sensitive person, needs to be aware that one can hurt people's feelings, saying that "a person in front of you, as your student can feel insecure, like a child, and the teacher has to give attention and be supportive. So, to be an English teacher, we need all these ingredients."

The last question of the interview was about the ideal classroom (where Error Treatment can be done in a comfortable way), and T1 commented that the ideal is to have a nice environment where the students can develop the four skills, and develop interaction with group work. Also, where they can change pairs, to have different experiences, see other points of view, and instead of just receiving they have to produce. She believes that the interaction between peers will help them to feel more secure to produce the language. Moreover, empathy with the students is also important.

The second teacher, T2 has a different opinion, saying that you have an ideal class, when students are paying out of their pockets, because then they are really committed, and this would be an adult class, Saturday morning groups, the ones who really need to study. But similarly, like the other teacher, she thinks that a teacher needs to have empathy with the students, a positive relationship with them, otherwise they get very cold, and make things very difficult.

T1 said that before taking the course “Especialização da Língua Inglesa” at UNITRITTER, she felt a little insecure in the procedure of correcting her students, but supported on the different models of corrective discourse (Lyster and Ranta 1997) and other studies, she is now confident with the error treatment in class.

She even asks the students to participate and help her select the way they prefer to be corrected, by displaying on the board the six types of corrective feedback: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. I think that she has benefited from the theory herself, and she also developed this intelligent strategy of having students participate in the decision of choosing how they want to be corrected, and this can help the job of the teacher. Through sharing this previous moment of selection with the learners, the teacher reduces the distance between the role of someone who is “judging” and someone else, who is “exposed”. There is the idea of allowance from the students, reducing stress that can affect teachers and students as well, during Error Treatment.

Something that is worth mentioning is that Lyster and Ranta’s model of corrective feedback seem to have universal applicability, and whether these techniques in correcting are used intuitively or learned along the years from observing other teachers, a teacher who didn’t have specific information about them, uses the same strategies observed in the French immersion classes with content-based L2 instruction, that originated the six types of corrective feedback. For example, when T2 explained two of the ways she interrupts a student discourse during an ill-formed sentence, without knowing how to name the patterns, she used a Clarification Request (elicit reformulation) with the question: “Are you sure of it?” and Explicit Correction, saying: “I’m sorry to interrupt, but you are wrong, it’s like this...” complementing with the correct form.

In the next section, I will present some excerpts from the students’ interviews and then, in the final section I will discuss findings and give my conclusion.

6.2 Students’ Interview

The purpose of this part of the study was to observe students’ ideas related to Error Treatment, and so, first I compared the answers of the six students, and then compared with the teachers’ answers. Although I consider all of them important, I have selected some of the answers to present from each question. I chose the answers that were more relevant to this research, the ones that called my attention immediately, for I could notice that the students took their time to think and elaborate their statements.

Answers to Question 1

Some of the students' answers for the first question – What does “error” mean? – were:

a) “It is the learning process. With the error, the deviation in understanding the theoretical/practical theme presented, is corrected, and the correction is established.”

What at first could be seen as contradictory in this statement “It is the learning process,” when compared to the principles based on Focus on Form instruction, becomes a coherent and similar definition of error. In her doctorate's thesis MENTI (2006) clearly explains this idea:

Focus on Form Instruction can adopt principles of the sociocultural theory. Here, errors are seen as a natural product of the learning process, but it is believed that the learners benefit from feedback given by the person they are interacting with and who knows more than they do. Under this point of view, Focus on Form instruction preconizes that receiving corrective feedback helps the learning process.

In this study, error is understood as resulting from the learning process, error is a consequence and not a barrier to the learning process (p.20).

b) “Error means an elaboration that diverges from what is scientifically acceptable. When we try to solve a problem, we always “mobilize” a set of skills to do this task. We can make evaluation errors, or errors of different nature in some moment of this “track”, and this generates the error, which should be object of reflection and correction of course, concept and attitudes.”

In my opinion, this student gives a broad concept of error which includes the consequent errors that can occur when someone is trying to produce something correct, counting on her own resources (or maybe also getting mislead even with a reference book). From these attempts, resulting in an error, comes an opportunity for reflection, and “reconstruction.”

c) “Error is everything done out of certain patterns.”

I believe the student understands that there are certain rules to be kept, that each Language has its own structure, and the way it works should be followed like a pattern. This student is conscious of these “rules” when expressing that everything out of this pattern could be considered wrong.

Answers to Question 2

From the second question – Do you think that the teacher should take into consideration the students' personality when making any correction? - here are some answers:

a) "I believe so. If the personality traits of the student are not considered, self-esteem can be hurt, and the understanding and correction of the errors may not be accepted, and the objective of the correction will not be achieved."

According to the student's beliefs, the teacher's approach when providing corrective feedback may interfere in the result of the student's performance. For this reason, the teacher has to be sensitive and alert during the correction procedure, "measuring" what to say, when and how to say it, conscious that correcting is not only giving the right answer, for dealing with human beings hardly ever escapes from touching emotional ground.

b) "I think the teacher should take into consideration the personality of the student. But more than this, the teacher should try to get on with the error (of the student and, mainly, with his/her own error) in a pedagogical way, causing error and practice to be objects of reflection, and from there on to become aim of the learning process..."

It is interesting to have such a rich material depicted from students' ideas and concepts, specially when there is resonance or connection with previous studies on this issue. As my objective is to compare teachers and students' ideas and beliefs related to procedures that involves dealing with Language Acquisition and Error Treatment, I find appropriate to establish here this connection with YU (2003):

Teachers need to reflect upon their own ideas and practices to be better informed. DEWEY (1933, p. 3) argued that teachers should be reflective-practitioners through questioning the beliefs and methods in their own experimental approach to schooling - psychology and sociology being tools or resources for the construction of new educational hypotheses to be tested against experience. Reflection is both an attitude and a practice.

c) "Yes, because we only have one "correct" choice, but the way people understand the correct form or assimilate the idea of what is correct, is something particular, and varies from person to person. Therefore, the teacher has to differentiate each student, and use his/her perception to understand each student's personality, and make the correction the best way possible."

I believe here the student mixed some different aspects. Although both aspects correspond to psychological approaches, one thing would be referring to each person's particular perception of an issue (that can be either right or wrong) , and another thing would be to deal with each student's personality. So, in this case, there can be an

association with the fact that the teacher has other things to take into consideration, besides the student's personality. For instance, the students' different "skills" or development stages to receive and digest information. But it is important to point out that this student believes that the teacher has to be careful with the students' personality, and has a high expectation from the teacher's behavior.

Answers to Question 3

Then, from the third question – When doing any correction, do you think the teacher should consider the students' proficiency level? I chose the following answers:

a) "I believe so. Following the same reasoning line of the previous answer, I think the teacher should "go the way back," trying to find the moment when the student made the error. When identifying this moment, the teacher should deepen, through dialogue, the concept that the student wrongly built. This dialogue with the student is never the same, because no student is like the other. And even if this correction procedure is done in a big group, the way of correcting also changes."

In my opinion, this student's perception is profound. She has the notion of an investigative attitude that carries within the idea of "Treatment". Again, it is something similar to a situation where a doctor could analyse and reach the cause of the disease, and from that moment on he could have a more accurate diagnosis and give the correct treatment to his patient. Once more, students can be compared with patients, where the same "medicine" is not always beneficial to everybody. Each case is a different case.

b) "Yes, because as well as the personality, the learning process is also particular. Students with more difficulties to learn must be treated more carefully and deserve a more detailed explanation of what they do not understand, so that, little by little, they may be able to grow within the group and clarify their ideas faster."

There is some similarity in this answer with the last answer given to the previous question where I commented about the teacher's duty to be alert about two aspects: personality, and different learning capacities. I agree with this student that differentiates personality from learning difficulties, and part of his contribution to teachers is that he is giving clues on how things can be solved. I would say that if one can read between the lines, the idea of being patient, supportive, and working the students' self-confidence is implicit.

Answers to Question 4

Finally, from the fourth question – Is correction always profitable for the student? Is there any moment when being corrected can become a negative experience? Give your opinion. - two answers from students who have similar points of view were selected:

a) “In my opinion, correction should be always well accepted, but depending on how it is done, it may hurt the student, depending on the tone of voice, gestures and the moment when it is done. It is very embarrassing, for example, to be corrected while doing a presentation in front of all classmates.”

Once more, how students can feel when exposed in front of a group, is being highlighted, and how teacher’s support and respectful approach is appreciated among students. My impression is that this student expects a reliable environment, because even adult students get vulnerable and insecure inside a classroom, and correction reaches a delicate territory, which can affect self-confidence.

b) “Yes, as long as it is not a bias act, and does not diminish the student in the presence of the group where he/she is (what could inhibit and become a negative experience for the person). As mentioned before, correction must be done considering the personality and the learning process of each one. If it is done considering these two factors, correction will always be beneficial to the student, as it promotes the intellectual growth of the student.”

This answer summarizes the students’ general position in this study, related to what a teacher should have in mind when providing any kind of feedback. Maybe this kind of situation can be better explained with the need that students have, no matter how old they are, to find in the classroom a kind of relationship they had with their parents, something that would remind them of “childhood security.” As a matter of fact, students can be very vulnerable because they feel they are in “the hands of” someone who knows more, who represents the authority in the classroom.

Being aware of what this position represents, teachers should have the responsibility of creating an environment where there is respect for the inevitable differences among students, specially related to personality. I understand that these students feel their different paces of learning should be respected, and their personal development should always be considered in a heterogeneous class, in order to help their language development.

6.3 Analysis of students’ responses

Out of an e-mail with the address of 41 students, six of them answered the four questions listed previously. Their teachers sent them an e-mail first, asking if they could contribute to this work, and then I sent them the questions. Maybe, because it was a

vacation period during summertime, not all of them were available to answer the questions. But what would motivate them to write their opinions about specific question on Error Treatment to a strange teacher? Besides the fact that they were answering as doing a special favor to their teachers, we can say that these six students can be also considered special, if we see this fact from the point of view that they took their time to think about error and the approach of treating an error in the classroom.

These students, from Pre-Intermediate and Intermediate Levels, are young professionals, and from a university level environment. They might have some different points of view when answering the questions, but they seem to be very committed with their learning development. In general, they have the same position of the two teachers interviewed in the first study I did, about Error Treatment. Maybe these similarities are due to the fact that teachers and students belong to the same “world,” or in other words, they have the same opportunities, with the background given in academic level.

Comparing some of the students answers with concepts written by Linguistic researchers, it is interesting to make some analogies, within the sociocultural theory, with a communicative approach, specially with the definition of “error”, where one of the students interviewed said:

Error is part of the learning process, it is part of life. A teacher should try to do this approach from the error in class, showing exactly this point of view to the students. Also, the teacher must look for the origin of these errors, to correct the course of that “fine adjustment” over the conceptions, presuppositions and conclusions that the student assumes through the way, which are mistaken.

Another sentence, and the one I found the most direct and striking definition of error was –“ It is the learning process.” What at first could seem contradictory, in fact “tunes” perfectly well with the concept that was adopted by the sociocultural theory, where it is said that “ error is part of the leaning process.” Complementing his answer, the student stated that “With the error, the deviation occurred in understanding the theoretical/practical theme presented, is corrected, and the correction is fixed (established).”

What is possible to understand here, from this statement, is that error occurrence makes the corrective feedback possible. When noticing the deviation, the learner can adopt and incorporate the correct form. Every time an error appears, so does an opportunity for the learner to review something that he/she could be reproducing in a wrong way. Furthermore, from that moment of interaction with the teacher, the student can have a new perspective in moving forward one more step, while developing the knowlegde of a knew language.

To reinforce this concept, we can report to MENTI and LIMA (2005, p. 3):

We understand error as an event resulting from the learning process, error is a consequence of the learning process and not a barrier to it. At the same time that it is a natural product of the learning process, we believe that error treatment is beneficial to the learning process, because when receiving treatment of his errors, the learner will be able to confirm and/or rethink his hypothesis about the Foreign Language operation, and reformulate his utterances to be better understood while engaged in interaction with his peers and teachers. We believe that this procedure leads to the learning process.

In the second question – Do you think that the teacher should take into consideration the student’s personality when making any correction? - only one of the students had a negative answer, justifying that in a big group it is difficult to consider the personality of each student. Furthermore, in order to be fair with other students, and not to favor anyone, he thinks that the teacher shouldn’t take into consideration someone’s personality. The other five students, agreeing with the teachers from the previous study, find it necessary to take into consideration the learners’ personality, being careful not to hurt their feelings. The answer of one of the interviewees represents their general ideas on this issue:

“I think so. If the student’s personality features are not considered, his self-esteem can be hurt, and the comprehension and error correction may not be accepted, and the goal of correcting will not be achieved.”

This thought also summarizes the beliefs that the two teachers interviewed have about being careful with the student’s personality (see pp. 13 and 14 in this study).

Also in the third question - When doing any correction, do you think teachers should consider the students proficiency level?, I found the same average of positive answers. The student that did not agree with the others, had an intriguing answer:

I think the teacher must know to what extent he has taught in class. Starting from there it is possible to evaluate what the student assimilated. I think that the teacher should not consider the stage of the learning process, in order to keep a demanding “pattern” to all students.

It seems that this student’s point of view is that the classroom should be seen as a whole, establishing a pattern to equalize everybody. I believe this student had in mind a heterogeneous class, where you cannot expect that all students bring the same knowledge (what is, in fact, the reality). He believes that the teacher should establish a criterion, when teaching, to reach the group as a whole. I suppose he is worried with the “speedy” students who get bored with the pace of the class, and this also happens.

I would define this statement as radical, because, besides the level of the students, you need to consider their personal stage during their learning process, consider their differences, and I believe that to keep everyone interested, instead of a demanding “pattern,” the teacher could resort to the supportive scaffolding following the sociocultural approach. This could be the case of promoting group or pair work, and observe that some students spontaneously take the “role of the teacher”. This role includes explaining and guiding the activity, clarifying instructions, checking vocabulary, and even making corrections. This kind of interaction allows the learners development in a more cooperative conception, instead of keeping the same demand to everyone.

From the last question, - Is correction always profitable for the student? Is there any moment when being corrected can become a negative experience? Give your opinion. – I could observe that most of the students answers, considered Error Treatment beneficial, as long as the teacher is careful in considering the students’ level and personality. These opinions are in agreement with the two teachers’ point of view, who have explained that they are careful with these aspects that involve the students’ level and personality.

Furthermore, in some parts of their excerpts, students are giving hints and recipes for teachers, when expressing how they feel according to the way teachers communicate with them when giving corrective feedback, be it through what they say, how they say it, in what occasion and even what gestures, or voice “pitch” teachers use. For instance:

... correction must be always well accepted, but depending on how it is done, it can, yes, embarrass the student, depending on the voice “pitch,” gestures and the occasion that is done. – It is very embarrassing, for example, to be corrected while doing a presentation in front of all your classmates.

7 - Conclusion

In my opinion, the students’ answers give a rich contribution to this brief study related to Error Treatment, because it shows that they are committed with the learning process with the perspective that learning is a building process of the language, where an error is not seen as a negative point, but, on the contrary, it is a natural part of the whole construction, until one becomes more proficient in the language.

According to more recent studies, following the sociocultural theory, this is the tendency to follow when observing errors in learners utterances, and treating them is also considered something positive and acceptable in the process of building knowledge. The term *scaffolding* (defined on p. 5), related to this approach of learning, gives the right idea of the interaction between a teacher and a student (or among peers) when giving support in each comment, or eliciting from the student some questions to clarify doubts, errors or

mistakes, or when providing information to the student in order to help the reconstruction of an utterance, whenever necessary.

During the first step of this study, while reading and comparing the answers of the six students to the first question – What does “error” mean? – some key words called my attention immediately, such as “pattern, deviation and diverge”, because they are the same words given by Linguistics researchers when giving a formal and technical definition to error. Observing the students’ statements, I would say that they are conscious of the importance of being corrected as a necessary and positive procedure, which is part of the learning process.

So, if in this short study I have found teachers who are worried in providing corrective feedback to their students, but at the same time, are concerned about more than just correcting, and first of all, are very careful in establishing a relationship based on mutual confidence, it is clear that these teachers understand the important role of Error Treatment.

The teachers know they have a tool in their hands. The fact that they are conscious of how careful they should be when using any kind of correction, to get a positive result through their interaction, shows that these teachers are interested in the development of the language. But more than that, they consider the psychological aspects which cannot be left apart in learning a foreign language. Therefore, I can say that they care about the students’ feelings, their reactions, and consider their personalities before giving any feedback.

These two teachers interviewed demonstrated that they are very careful with their students, and through negotiation, or taking some time to observe the students, they both agree that they need to know the students’ personality before they feel at ease to make any correction. From these interviews results an idea of how this issue – feedback – can influence the development of the student, how teachers follow their intuition, and how important it is to conquer a confident environment with the students to attain a collaborative response in the classroom while dealing with Error Treatment.

Another point to comment about this issue is the efficacy, or in other words, the result of it. Do all students retain and internalize what was dealt with error correction? As T1 said, students’ errors can persist even after being corrected. For that reason, working with feedback can be a long process, and does not always guarantee success in learning a language. Furthermore, the data were limited because only two interviews were made, and I did not attend any of their classes to compare with the interviews.

I also contacted students who are receptive to Error Treatment, and, in general, share the same opinions with the two teachers. They want to be corrected, but correction belongs to a delicate field of interaction, and these six students expect this subject to be

treated in a similar way to the comparison already mentioned in the beginning of this article, which is a relation between a doctor and a patient. These students can be compared to patients who want not only an efficient, but a wise, gentle and supportive healer.

The findings and their analyses have led me to conclude that the teachers and students selected for these two studies agree with the idea of Error Treatment, having similar ideas about how errors should be treated in class. However, further studies are necessary with different teachers and students from private English courses, in order to have a more accurate result and contribution to this short research.

8 - References

ALLWRIGHT, D.; BAILEY, K. **Focus on the language classroom**: an introduction to classroom research for teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

CORDER, S.P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. **International Review of Applied Linguistics**, n. 5, p.161-9, 1967.

CUNHA, A. P.; MENTI, M. M. **A Abordagem com foco na Forma e o feedback Corretivo no Ensino de L2/LE**. Porto Alegre: IX CONGRESSO INTERNACIONAL DA ABRALIC, 2004.

DABBAGH, N. Vygotsky's. **Social development theory**. Mar. 8 1999. disponível em: <<http://chd.gmu.edu/immersion/knowledgebase/theorists/constructivism/vygotsky.htm>>. Acesso em: Jan. 5 2007.

DEWEY, J. **How we think**. Boston. : D.C. Health and Co.

ELLIS, R. **The study of second language acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

FREUDENBERGER, F.; LIMA, M. Relacionando crenças e tratamento do erro na aula de língua estrangeira: um estudo de caso. In: ROTTAVA, L; LIMA, M. **Linguística aplicada** : relacionando teoria e prática no ensino de línguas. Ijuí; Unijuí, 2003.

FREUDENBERGER, F.; LIMA, M. **A correção de erros como co-construção de conhecimento na aula de inglês como língua estrangeira**. In: III FILE - Fórum Internacional de Ensino de Línguas Estrangeiras, 2004, Pelotas. Anais FILE III. Pelotas : UFPEL, 2004. (no prelo).

LIGHTBOWN, P.; SPADA, N. **How languages are learned**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

LIGHTBOWN, P. The importance of timing in focus on form. In: DOUGHTY, C.; WILLIAMS, J. (Eds.). **Focus on Form in classroom second language acquisition**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. p.177-196.

LIGHTBOWN, P.M.; SPADA, N. Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: effects on second language learning. **Studies in Second Language acquisition**, Local, n. 12, p. 429-448, 1990.

LIMA, M. S. Aquisição de L2/LE e o insumo instrucional na sala de aula. In: ARAUJO, D. ; STURM, L. (Eds.). **Século XXI: um novo olhar sobre o ensino e a aprendizagem de línguas estrangeiras**. Passo Fundo: UPF, 2002. p. 22-24.

LYSTER, R.; RANTA, L. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in cocommunicative classrooms. **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, [s.l.], n. 19, p. 37-66, 1997.

McCORMICK, D. E.; DONATO R. **Teacher questions as scaffolded assistance in an ESL Classroom**. Pittsburg: Pittsburg University, 1997.

MENTI, M. M.; LIMA, M. **O feedback corretivo e a Instrução com foco na forma**. Local: editora, 2005.

MENTI, M. M. **O que norteia a escolha de professores de língua estrangeira por diferentes tipos de feedback corretivo**. 2006. Tese (Doutorado) –Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2006.

PANOVA, I.; LYSTER, R. **Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom**. TESOL Quarterly, [s.l.], v. 36, n. 4, 2002.

RICHARDS, J. C.; RODGERS, T. S. **The audiolingual method** . approaches and methods in language teaching. 2nd ed.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

RUSSEL, J.; SPADA, N. **The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition**. Toronto: University of Toronto, 2004.

SHERER, L. **O tratamento do erro e sua relação com concepções sobre ensino e aprendizagem de Inglês como língua estrangeira**. Dissertação (Mestrado) Univerisdade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2000.

SKINNER, B.F. **Verbal behavior**. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, [s.d.].

TATAWY, M. Corrective feedback in language acquisition. Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers. **TESOL & Applied Linguistics**, [s.l.], v. 4, n. 2, 2004.

THE VARIABLE shape of interlanguage. 2007. Disponível em:

<[http:// duermueller.tripod.com/interlanguage.html](http://duermueller.tripod.com/interlanguage.html)>. Acesso em: 19 fev. 2007.

TOCALLI, A; SWAIN, M. Reformulation : the cognitive conflict and L2 learning it generates. **International Journal of Applied Linguistics**, Local, v. 15, n. 1, 2005.

VAN DER STUYF, R. R. Scaffolding as a teaching strategy. **Adolescent Learning and Development**, [s.l.], 17 nov. 2002. Disponível em:

<[http:// condor.adm.ccny.cuny.edu](http://condor.adm.ccny.cuny.edu)>. Acesso em: 2002.

YU, Guoxing. Perception, practice and progress: significance of scaffolding and zone of proximal development for second or foreign language teachers. **Asian EFL Journal On-Line Tefl Journal**, [s.l.], v. 6, 5 jan. 2007. Disponível em:

<[http:// www.asian.efl-journal.com.december 04 Gy.html](http://www.asian.efl-journal.com.december04Gy.html)>. Acesso em: 2007

8 - Anexos

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

Acredito que erro pode significar um engano ou falta de atenção, o correto é ter um mínimo de senso antes de fazer algo que possa estar errado.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo? Explique.

Sim, o aluno muitas vezes ao corrigir o professor está colaborando para o aprendizado de todo o grupo, e acredito que os professores devem somar isso como participação na aula.

3 - Ao fazer uma correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizado em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Sim.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

Penso que nem sempre é benéfica, pois em muitos momentos ao querer explicar algo o aluno talvez não saiba expressar o seu conhecimento de tal assunto. Talvez para alunos que tenham mais dificuldades o aprendizado pode ser mais demorado para saber ou ter certeza de quando se está errado.

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

Quando acontece algo que não é o certo, que deveria ser de outra forma.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo. Explique.

Sim, pois o “certo” é um só, mas a forma das pessoas entenderem o correto ou assimilarem a idéia do certo, é particular, e varia de pessoa para pessoa. Logo o professor tem sim que diferenciar cada aluno e usar sua percepção para entender a personalidade de cada aluno e corrigi-lo da melhor forma possível.

3 - Ao fazer uma correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizado em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Sim, pois como a personalidade, o aprendizado, também é particular. Alunos com mais dificuldades para aprender devem ser tratados com mais cuidado e merecem uma explicação mais detalhada do que não entendem para que aos poucos ele possa crescer no grupo e esclarecer suas idéias mais rapidamente.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

Sim desde que ela não seja um ato de preconceito e que não minimize o aluno perante o grupo em que ele se encontra (o que poderia inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa para a pessoa). Como dito anteriormente, a correção deve ser feita de modo a considerar a personalidade e o aprendizado de cada um. Se ela for feita levando em conta esses dois fatores, ela vai ser sempre benéfica ao aluno uma vez que ela promove o crescimento intelectual do aluno.

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

Para mim, erro significa uma elaboração que diverge daquilo que é aceitável cientificamente. Quando procuramos resolver algum problema, sempre mobilizamos um conjunto de saberes para essa tarefa. Pode-se cometer erros de avaliação, ou de quaisquer

outra natureza, em algum momento desse percurso, e isso gera o erro, que deve ser objeto de reflexão e de correção de rumos, de conceitos e de atitudes.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo? Explique.

Acho que o professor deve sim levar em conta a personalidade do aluno. Mas mais do que isso, o professor deve procurar conviver com o erro (do aluno e, principalmente, dele) de uma forma pedagógica, fazendo com que o erro e a prática sejam objetos de reflexão para, a partir disso, também tornarem-se objetos de aprendizado. O erro faz parte do aprendizado, faz parte da vida. O professor deve tentar fazer essa abordagem do erro em sala de aula, mostrando para seus alunos exatamente isso. Também deve tentar buscar a origem desses erros para corrigir os rumos, fazer aquele “ajuste fino” nas concepções, nos pressupostos e conclusões que o aluno assume ao longo do percurso, e que estão equivocados.

3 - Ao fazer uma correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizado em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Acredito que sim. Seguindo a mesma linha de raciocínio da resposta anterior, acho que o professor deve “fazer o caminho de volta”, tentando buscar o momento no qual o aluno cometeu o erro. A partir da identificação desse momento, o professor deve aprofundar, pelo diálogo, o conceito que o aluno construiu equivocadamente. Esse diálogo com o aluno nunca é igual, pois nenhum aluno é igual ao outro. E mesmo que esse procedimento de correção seja feito em grande grupo, a forma também muda.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

A correção de erro na perspectiva que desenvolvi aqui, na minha opinião, é sempre benéfica. Porém, nem sempre é assim. Muitos professores que atuam hoje não tratam o erro dessa forma e acabam criando relações professor/aluno e aluno/aluno estigmatizadas em sala de aula. Os alunos que têm seus erros ‘socializados’ na classe tendem a ser taxados de ‘pouco inteligentes’ e passam a ter uma relação negativa com seus próprios erros, e isso prejudica muito o processo de ensino e aprendizagem.

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

Algo que não é correto, que não tem sentido lógico para a pessoa, nem para os demais. Algo que comprovadamente não tem sentido.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo? Explique.

Acho que não, até mesmo porque é bastante difícil fazer isso numa turma grande, por exemplo, e também parr ser justo com os demais alunos.

3 - Ao fazer uma correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizado em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Acho que o professor deve saber o até que ponto ensinou em aula. A partir disso é possível avaliar até que ponto o aluno assimilou. Acho que o professor não deve considerar o nível de aprendizado, par que possa manter um “padrão” de exigência com todos os alunos.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

Acredito que na maioria das vezes ele é benéfica, mas pode se tornar negativa se, por exemplo, o professor fazer desse erro motivo de gozação. Mas, muitas vezes, é errando que nunca mais nos esquecemos do que é correto.

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

É o aprendizado. Com o erro, corrige-se o desvio ocorrido no entendimento do tema teórico/prático apresentado, e fixa-se sua correção.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo? Explique.

Creio que sim. Se os traços da personalidade do aluno não forem considerados, pode-se ferir sua auto-estima e o entendimento e a correção do erro podem não ser aceitas e o objetivo da correção não será atingido.

3 - Ao fazer um correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizagem em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Certamente. O professor não logrará êxito na correção, se não repassar os conteúdos teóricos corretos na ordem cronológica e de raciocínio que for mais conveniente dentro do nível de conhecimento adquirido pelo aluno.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

Sim, desde que considere os traços (alguns) da personalidade, nível de aprendizado e raciocínio de cada alluno, e ainda a heterogeneidade de conhecimento prévio do grupo.

QUESTIONÁRIO SOBRE TRATAMENTO DO ERRO EM SALA DE AULA

1 - Qual o significado de “erro”?

Erro é tudo aquilo que é feito fora de certos padrões.

2 - Você acha que o professor deve levar em conta a personalidade do aluno ao corrigi-lo? Explique.

Não. Corrigir é necessário, mas o professor deve levar em consideração a personagem do aluno quando se referir a ele; como no tom de voz, e gestos a fazer.

3 - Ao fazer uma correção, o professor deve considerar o nível de aprendizado em que o aluno se encontra? Por quê?

Sim. Porque não se pode exigir do aluno mais do que ele pode saber. Creio que por haver esse tipo de exigência, fora do nível em que se encontra o aluno, é que causa confusão e muitas vezes o desmotiva. É necessário “exigir” o que ele sabe, para que isso inclusive se firme bem em seu pensamento sobre a outra língua.

4 - A correção é sempre benéfica para o aluno? Existe algum momento em que ela pode inibir e se tornar uma experiência negativa? Dê sua opinião.

No meu ponto de vista, correção deve ser sempre bem aceita, porém dependendo de como esta é feita, pode sim inibir o aluno, dependendo do tom de voz, gestos e a ocasião em que é feita. – É muito constrangedor, por exemplo, ser corrigido enquanto se faz uma apresentação em frente a todos os colegas.